

**Waste 2 Resources Advisory Committee Meeting
Flip Chart Notes
September 18, 2012**

Acronyms

C&D	construction and demolition
CPG	Coordinated Prevention Grant
DOR	Department of Revenue
LEED	Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design
MTCA	Model Toxics Control Account
NIMBY	not in my backyard
UTC	Utilities and Transportation Commission (State of WA)
WRRLLCA	Waste Reduction, Recycling and Litter Control Account
WSP	Washington State Patrol

Discussion – WRRLLCA Funded Programs, Share Opinions

Refer to Table 2 from “Response to Questions from the July 17, 2012 Waste 2 Resources Advisory Committee Meeting” listing of W2R program activities

In Favor	Not in Favor
INCREASING & IMPROVING RECYCLING	
Technical Assistance to Locals and Businesses	
Assistance from Ecology needed by locals (expertise)	
Creates consistency across state (and fairness)	
Information Clearinghouse	
Important resource (document sharing)	More funding for it to fully work
Unique	
Protects CPG grants	
State is only place that can gather all the information (however needs improvement)	
Comments: relies on locals to provide information, software compatibility issues with documents, ways to measure how much it is used to actually share information	
Commingle Recycling Study	
Provides good information	
Collaborative process	
Mapping Recycling Facilities	
Shows uniqueness around state (shows one size does not fit all)	May not be a priority
Would help with geographically layering/locating new programs	
Valuable planning tool	
Valuable to local governments if completed	

In Favor	Not in Favor
Packaging	
State assistance to local governments important	Not considered core function
Big issue with public (hear about it often)	Hasn't seen productive response (for bags mostly)
Ecology involvement important statewide and nationally	Banning seems to be main approach – need for broader perspective on topic
Focus on proactive result; Ecology needs to be proactive	
Comments: industry seems to be handling bags; locals need to help get the word out	
Product-specific Programs	
If for toxics (favored limited scope)	Funds should focus on WRRLCA taxed items
If economic justification (analytics)	
Ecology should look at programs to see what makes sense (life-cycle analysis needed)	
Focus on using existing infrastructure	
Look at more products, look at more than product stewardship	
Needs to be bigger than just toxics to address the whole waste hierarchy	
Transporting Recyclables	
Good activity	
Ecology work with UTC, WSP, and DOR	
Strongly favor	
1-800-RECYCLE Hotline	
Favor, but needs more discussion/work (reboot) (centralized point of contact)	Labor intensive
Retain citizen access to information statewide	Local governments can explain their own programs better
Heavily used	Not all locals use it
Comments: consider subcommittee	
School Recycling Awards	
Favor, with discussion/work (reboot)	
Youth education	
Bring in solid waste companies through revenue sharing	
ORGANICS MANAGEMENT	
Composting education, facility compliance, technical assistance are core (also look at capacity/infrastructure)	Backyard composting and natural yard care fit better at local level
Work on community response when siting facilities	Organics not a good fit for WRRLCA 30% funds
Food waste prevention core issue	
More technical assistance to food businesses for composting	

In Favor	Not in Favor
Comments: need to look at capacity issues, NIMBY for locating new compost facilities, developing markets for compost	
CONSTRUCTION & DEMOLITION (Green Building)	
Favor because existing problems	Not good fit for WRRLCA 30%
LEED and other green building standards have lots of potential (look at more tools)	Fund via building industry
Comments: LEED C&D recycling requirement may lead to cheating	
MODERATE RISK WASTE	
Moderate Risk Waste is important	Appropriate to fund with MTCA
STATE SOLID WASTE PLANNING	
Favor 4 programs required by statute: local planning, state planning, data, rules	Not valuable right now
Favor 4 programs: appropriate for both WRRLC and MTCA	
Favor all 6 programs: local planning, state planning, data, rules, laws, finance	Five year update may be too often and too costly
Increase time between plan updates	Keep five year update but with less effort
One of few opportunities for citizen input	
Important but consider regular course corrections	
LOCAL SOLID & HAZARDOUS WASTE PLANNING & IMPLEMENTATION ASSISTANCE	
Favor 4 programs required by statute: local planning, state planning, data, rules	Five year update may be too often and too costly
Favor all 6 programs: local planning, state planning, data, rules, laws, finance	Keep five year update but with less effort
One of few opportunities for citizen input	
DATA COLLECTION AND REPORTING	
Favor 4 programs required by statute: local planning, state planning, data, rules	
Favor all 6 programs: local planning, state planning, data, rules, laws, finance	
Data collection	
SOLID WASTE LAWS UPDATE	
Favor all 6 programs: local planning, state planning, data, rules, laws, finance	Laws update is not vital in next biennium
Solid Waste Laws Update: possibly shorten scope, conduct sometime later	
Though not required by statute, needed to do Ecology job well	
Don't let this get lost – do sometime	
FINANCING THE SOLID WASTE SYSTEM	
Favor all 6 programs: local planning, state planning, data, rules, laws, finance	

In Favor	Not in Favor
Financing solid waste system critical	
Though not required by statute, needed to do Ecology job well	
RULE DEVELOPMENT	
Favor 4 programs required by statute: local planning, state planning, data, rules	
Favor all 6 programs: local planning, state planning, data, rules, laws, finance	

Parking Lot

- Discuss limiting funding to only products that pay into WRRLCA
- Discuss moving solid waste plans update until later
- Possible Subcommittees or further discussion with W2RAC in 2013:
 - 1-800 recycling hotline “reboot”
 - School awards “reboot”
 - State and Local Plan update timelines
 - Green Building tools
 - Solid Waste laws update

Next Steps

- Webinar for questions based on parking lot information before 11/20/2012 meeting in late October/early November.
- Provide information on programs to advisory committee (mid-October):
 - Level of funding per program (\$ to \$\$\$\$\$ ratings)
 - Information on level of effort
 - Historic funding – significant differences
 - Adequacy of funding levels